

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

C 7 Ag

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

A Brief Summary of Economic Conditions

SEP 2 - 1947

ISSUED MONTHLY BY THE BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

RECEIVED
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

CERTIFICATE: By direction of the Secretary of Agriculture the matter contained herein is published as statistical information and is required for the proper transaction of the public business. Free distribution is limited to copies "necessary in the transaction of public business required by law." Subscription price: 25 cents per year; single copy, 5 cents payable in cash or money order to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Washington, D.C.

MARCH 1, 1934

Volume 18, No. 3

HARD WINTER—BETTER INCOME—MORE CATTLE

Last month was a hard one on winter wheat, meadows, and pastures, in the eastern part of the country. The extremely cold weather drove the frost deep into the ground and worked havoc which will not be fully apparent until next summer. It has been a hard winter on livestock and has cost farmers a considerable loss of stored potatoes, vegetables, and fruit. Following several cold waves there have been periods of unseasonably mild weather in the West.

It has had an effect upon milk production. By the first of February, production per cow was averaging only 11.61 pounds a day, compared with 12.74 pounds a year ago, which is a decrease of nearly 9 percent.

The movement of grain and certain other crops to market has tended to slow down since the first of the year, but livestock and livestock products have continued to move in fairly heavy volume.

Export movement in January showed some falling off in wheat, tobacco, and pork products. Apple exports were moderately large and cotton shipments held up fairly well.

The cold storage situation still shows a heavy stock of butter, in spite of a large outward movement during January. Supplies of pork and beef in storage, while larger than a year ago, are about average.

The annual inventory of livestock on farms, made as of January 1, showed a 3 percent increase in cattle during last year, but 9 percent decreases in hogs, 1 percent in sheep, and 2 percent in horses. The total number of farm animals, reckoned on a comparable unit basis, showed practically no change during the year. The number of milk cows increased about 3 percent, as did heifer calves. In the case of horses, it is significant that the trend of production at last appears to have turned upward—for the first time in many years the number of young colts shows a substantial increase.

Higher prices for horses, mules, and sheep more than offset the declines per head in cattle and hogs, so that the total value of the farm animals on January 1, 1934 (\$2,854,000,000) was about 7 percent larger than a year previous. The value of hogs and pigs per head, \$4.16, was the lowest since 1897.

The general rise in prices of farm products was reflected in the figures on farm income compiled last month. Income from agricultural production in 1933 was about \$6,114,000,000. This, added to about \$289,000,000 of rental and benefit payments from the A.A.A., made a total farm income of \$6,403,000,000 for the year 1933, which was 24 percent larger than that of the previous year. The main increases were from vegetables, grains, and cotton, but all the major farm enterprises returned a larger income except dairy and poultry. The gross income from cotton was a half larger than in 1932 and from grain was nearly doubled.

GROSS FARM INCOME IN 1933 ESTIMATED AT \$6,403,000,000

The September issue of the Agricultural Situation carried a preliminary estimate of gross income from farm production in 1933 of \$6,360,000,000 including rental and benefit payments. In that report it was pointed out that farmers' marketings were usually largest during the last 4 months of the year, which made this estimate very uncertain, and that total payments to farmers for restricting 1933 production were not yet definitely known.

Data covering a large part of the marketings of livestock and livestock products in 1933 are now available and a large proportion of most of the crops have been marketed, thus providing a more accurate check on gross farm income from 1933 production. Present indications point to a gross farm income for 1933 including rental and benefit payments of \$6,403,000,000. Gross income from 1933 production is estimated to be \$6,114,000,000 and total rental and benefits already paid or to be paid to farmers on 1933 contracts will total approximately \$289,000,000.

GROSS INCOME FROM FARM PRODUCTION BY GROUPS OF COMMODITIES, 1929-33

Source of income	Year ¹				
	1929	1930	1931	1932 ²	1933 ³
	<i>Million dollars</i>	<i>Million dollars</i>	<i>Million dollars</i>	<i>Million dollars</i>	<i>Million dollars</i>
Crops:					
Grains.....	1, 283	779	474	322	600
Fruits and nuts.....	706	567	453	340	403
Vegetables.....	1, 132	943	724	596	785
Sugar crops.....	85	94	69	68	71
Cotton and cottonseed.....	1, 389	751	528	431	670
Tobacco.....	286	212	132	111	180
Other crops.....	540	453	334	245	320
Total crops.....	5, 421	3, 799	2, 714	2, 113	3, 029
Livestock and livestock products:					
Cattle and calves.....	1, 111	951	681	502	505
Hogs.....	1, 531	1, 350	912	538	580
Sheep and wool.....	262	204	158	107	150
Poultry and eggs.....	1, 230	1, 050	809	603	580
Dairy products.....	2, 323	2, 031	1, 614	1, 260	1, 250
Other.....	40	29	23	20	20
Total, livestock.....	6, 497	5, 615	4, 197	3, 030	3, 085
Total, crops and livestock.....	11, 918	9, 414	6, 911	5, 143	6, 114
Rental and benefit payments.....					289
Total income.....	11, 918	9, 414	6, 911	5, 143	6, 403

¹ Crop year for crops, calendar year for livestock and livestock products

² Subject to revision.

³ Preliminary. Based on production marketings and prices during 1933.

The estimated gross income by groups of commodities for 1933 is shown in the following table together with the previously published estimates from 1929 to 1932. The estimates for 1932 are still preliminary and subject to revision. The 1933 estimates are based upon farm production and upon prices and marketings thus far in the 1933-34 crop marketing season. Both the 1932 and 1933 estimates will be revised when more detailed information regarding farmers' total marketings in 1933 is available.

Practically all the increase in income in 1933, in comparison with 1932, is the result of sharply higher prices for crops which more than offset the reduced output of many farm crops. Income from grains made the greatest increase when compared with 1932. Gross income from grains, excluding rental and benefit payments, was 86 percent greater than in 1932 and 27 percent greater than in 1931 but was still only 47 percent of 1929. Gross income from cotton and cottonseed was 55 percent greater in 1933 than in 1932 but was only 48 percent of 1929. Income from all groups of crops was greater in 1933 than in 1932 and with the exception of fruits and nuts and other crops was greater than in 1931. All crops returned farmers 43 percent more in 1933 than in 1932, 12 percent more than in 1931, but 44 percent less than in 1929.

Unusually low prices for livestock and livestock products during the first 4 months of 1933 greatly curtailed the income from these products. During the latter half of 1933, income from livestock was somewhat higher than a year earlier but for the year as a whole, gross income was only 2 percent greater than in 1932 and was 53 percent below 1929. The greatest increase in income from livestock was from sheep and wool and was largely the result of the sharply higher prices of wool during 1933. Income from hogs was 8 percent higher than in 1932 while income from cattle and calves was about the same and income from dairy and poultry products was lower than in 1932.

Total rental and benefit payments for restricting production includes the payment for plowing up cotton acreage and margin on cotton options, the payments for pigs and sows slaughtered to reduce production, the payment to tobacco growers for curtailing 1933 acreage and the payment to wheat growers for reducing acreage for the 1934 harvest.

CLARENCE M. PURVES,
Division of Statistical and Historical Research.

THE COTTON SITUATION

Plans and arrangements for the production of the crop just harvested were made with prices ranging around 6 cents. While the crop was being planted, prices ranged from 6 cents upward to about 9 cents a pound. Whether because of the fact that cotton had proved again the best income producer of the South, or because the cheaper cotton is the more it takes to pay debts, or because of the widely shared hope of price raising measures to follow, the planted area of 36,542,000 acres in the year before was increased to 40,929,000 acres. With a carryover of old cotton at the end of July which turned out to be 11,597,000 bales, and only a little below the historic peak carryover of 1932, a huge supply of cotton was in prospect for the year.

To reduce the surplus which appeared to be approaching ominous proportions and restore, insofar as could be done in a single season,

a more normal balance of supply with consumption, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration undertook, promptly upon the enactment of its legislation, a program to remove from production 25 percent of the area already planted. The plow-up campaign, unprecedented as it was, met with abundant support and succeeded in bringing the acreage down from almost 41,000,000 to a little more than 30,000,000. Its effectiveness was unfortunately offset by a growing season which turned out to be extraordinarily favorable to the crop. The yield per acre, which prior to 1933 had averaged over a 5-year period only about 174 pounds, jumped to over 209 pounds. Continued good weather through the late summer and fall brought the estimated crop to 13,177,000 bales, equal substantially to that of the preceding year and about a million and a half bales less than the world consumption of American cotton in the 12 months preceding August 1, 1933.

This development pushed into the future by another year the desired return to a carryover of under 5,000,000 bales. Without, however, the 1933 plow-up, it is estimated that the year's crop would have been more than 4,400,000 bales larger, and that had prices warranted the picking of it all, the 1933 crop would have reached the huge total of 17,600,000 bales or about 118 percent of the annual world consumption of American cotton at current rates, while the total world supply of American cotton would have mounted to over 29,000,000 bales, equal to the needs of the world for 2 years.

Notwithstanding the large supply of cotton for the 1933-34 season which resulted, in spite of the 1933 production-control program, a strong price situation has developed. Advancing prices accompanied the 1933 program of crop limitation, stimulated obviously by the inflationary psychology of the time, by a phenomenal upsurge in consumption of cotton by domestic mills for a short period preceding completion of the code and levying of processing taxes, and concurrently by a somewhat unseasonable but none the less welcome increase in exports which developed as recovery began to gain headway abroad, and by the favorable progress of the crop-reduction program. By the end of July the advance had carried prices with little interruption to the level of about 12 cents. At about that point, however, decreased purchases by domestic mills coupled with a realization of the prospects for a high yield and a comparatively large crop, reversed the price trend and started a decline which carried prices downward to less than 9 cents, and the level of 10 cents was not reached again until late December.

In this emergency a plan of crop curtailment to 25,000,000 acres in 1934 was announced, and the Commodity Credit Corporation was formed to lend growers 10 cents a pound on all cotton of their 1933 crop not of undesirable quality, conditioned upon pledges of borrowers to cooperate in the 1934 crop program.

This was followed shortly by a plan for advancing to holders of options on spot cotton at 6 cents, 4 cents additional in consideration of the assignment of their options to a pool. Slow in their effect upon prices for a number of weeks, during which cotton continued to sell materially cheaper than its loan value, gradually the loans which were supplemented by Cotton Belt lending agencies, lightened the weight of the crop upon the market and prompted a holding movement among growers wide in extent and of unusual strength. By the late weeks of 1933, withholding by farmers had produced a

relative scarcity of spot market offerings, and, in spite of the large stocks on hand cotton was actually becoming hard to buy. This feature of the situation was intensified when late in December an extraordinary demand appeared again in the cloth markets and mills increased their purchases of cotton to cover the requirements occasioned by their newly booked orders. At the same time a firm demand from abroad was in evidence.

Under these conditions prices rose almost steadily until by the middle of February they were the highest of the season and in the range of 12 to 13 cents were approximately double those of a year earlier. At this time domestic mills are said to be liberally supplied with orders running well into the future, while retailers are generally showing a desire to replenish depleted stocks of goods. Consumption in the United States for the first 6 months of the season totaled 2,847,000 bales, while world consumption of American cotton for this same period was reported by the New York Cotton Exchange to be 7,045,000 bales. Both figures show increases over last year.

Highly unusual conditions have influenced the export situation since the crop began to be marketed. With the dollar declining in the foreign exchange market through most of this period, European purchases were restrained and, although total exports to the middle of February were about even with the level of the year before, shipments to Europe were somewhat below last year, notwithstanding evident improvement in general business conditions there. With revaluation of the dollar accomplished, some tendency on the part of European buyers to purchase cotton more freely was noted. Japanese interests, on the other hand, purchased heavily in this country early in the 1933-34 season, resuming the Japanese position as the largest overseas customer for American cotton first established in 1931-32 but relinquished to Germany in 1932-33.

Much interest has centered in this phase of the export situation. From a position of advantage gained during the World War, Japanese manufacturing interests have extended their export trade in cotton textiles throughout the world, and especially in the Eastern Hemisphere. Meantime, however, tariff barriers were raised in India against foreign-made goods and increased from time to time which were felt particularly by Japanese manufacturers. About the middle of 1933 they reached a height which evoked a stern protest from Japanese spinners in the form of an agreement to suspend all further purchases of Indian raw cotton, which in the 10 preceding years had comprised about half of the total Japanese consumption, although in the 2 previous years it had fallen to less than a third. Although some Indian cotton was available on uncompleted contracts and from stocks previously accumulated in Japan, this situation doubtless contributed somewhat to the large purchases of American cotton.

In January 1934, however, a compromise settlement was effected by which Japan agreed in the future to purchase a considerable quantity of Indian cotton in consideration of proportionate Indian takings of Japanese-made cotton goods. Since, however, it appears that takings of raw cotton will produce a quantity of goods exceeding by a wide margin the return shipments specified, some question remains as to the reflex influence of the agreement upon future purchases of American cotton, although at present price ratios of American and Indian cotton, Japanese-Indian commitments may not exceed the amount of such cotton that would in any case be consumed. In

spite of the apparent improvement in the position of Indian raw cotton as a result of the agreement, Indian prices have continued at the lowest ratio with American cotton that has prevailed since 1929-30, while in Japan a trend is apparent toward the production of finer yarns for which cotton of the usual American staple lengths is required.

As yet the lower relative price of foreign growths of cotton, as compared with American cotton prices in Liverpool, has apparently not greatly affected the consumption of American cotton in foreign countries. According to the New York Cotton Exchange figures, the consumption of foreign cottons in the world during the period from August 1 to December 31 is running somewhat above the consumption for the same months a year ago. Price parities are becoming more favorable to foreign cottons, however, as the 1933-34 crop in foreign countries (some of which harvest their cotton later than the American crop) begins to move to market.

For clues to what lies ahead for American cotton, the market has for some time been intently watching the progress of measures aimed at the control of production in 1934. As a result of the campaign for growers' signatures to contracts of voluntary reduction it was announced at the middle of February that about 12,000,000 acres had been signed out of approximately 16,000,000 acres scheduled, while hope remained that the whole would ultimately be signed. Reinforcing the voluntary program, Federal credit for production purposes which is a necessity to many growers, has been reserved for the use of cooperating growers. Mitigating the prospects of reduction, however, are the influence of current prices, well advanced preparations for the next crop, active mule markets, and indications of large increases in fertilizer sales to growers. In view of these conditions, proposed legislation for the compulsory restriction of production has been receiving earnest and attentive consideration.

A question of moment in the consideration of acreage or crop curtailment, by whatever methods may finally be employed, is the extent to which the expansion of production in foreign countries may at the same time be stimulated. Much attention has been given to the fact that the reduction program of 1933 was accompanied by increases in production in the more important foreign countries which brought the total of foreign cotton production to the highest figure since the predepression season of 1928-29.

There is, however, little evidence of a direct relationship between these facts. In part the increased production abroad is attributable to increased yields and in part to a return to the cultivation of more normal acreages following reductions in earlier years. As for the future, too little is yet known of the crop adjustments which growers in other countries are inclined to make in response to changes in the prices of cotton and other crops.

Nevertheless, it is important to observe that, with the decline in the exchange value of the dollar, foreign producers are not generally experiencing price increases this year comparable with those enjoyed by American growers. While prices of American cotton in this country have doubled within the year, the increase in Liverpool expressed in pence has been only about a third. Inasmuch as the currencies of India, Egypt, the Sudan and certain lesser producing countries are linked to the pound sterling, producers in those countries have felt little stimulus of advancing prices. Oomra No. 1, Indian cotton

which was quoted there in February 1933 at 4.43 pence, had advanced only to 4.80 pence on the corresponding day of February 1934, while Egyptian uppers were only a little higher than a year earlier. While Egypt now pursues a policy of cotton production unrestrained by Government decrees, natural limitations must continue for some time to hold in check any desire to increase acreage greatly. In China, the year's advance in silver prices tends to reduce cotton prices to Chinese growers in terms of local currencies, while in Russia production is believed to be motivated to a large extent by forces other than price.

ARTHUR W. PALMER,
Division of Cotton Marketing.

THE RANGE CATTLE SITUATION

Midwinter finds the range cattlemen still in a rather bad situation, but hopeful for the future. Their troubles have arisen from several sources, some within the industry itself and others without. Over these sources they have no control. Few major agricultural endeavors, in fact, have so many indirect influences of such vital importance as has western beef-cattle production. But there are several underlying factors of hope. This hope has been projected into long-time planning as evidenced by the higher prices which have been paid at all of the winter purebred sales for high quality, wellbred, beef-breed bulls of the more popular families.

A factor of major regional importance that has crept into the picture in the cattle country west of the hundredth meridian and which is often lost sight of in evaluating the range situation is the growth of population on the Pacific coast during the last 10 or 12 years. The census of 1930 showed that California, Oregon, and Washington gained over 50 percent since 1920, California alone making a gain of nearly 70 percent, and Southern California of around 125 percent.

Surplus producers of cattle less than 10 years ago, these States now are deficit producers and receive both feeder and fat-cattle shipments from upward of 17 States and in practically every month of the year. Whereas stockmen in Idaho, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado formerly thought in terms of Missouri River markets, now their plans are being influenced by what the Pacific coast wants and how best they can fill that demand. Buyers for the coast do not furnish an outlet for all classes and grades of range cattle, but for the kinds they do want they dominate the Denver, Ogden, and Salt Lake City markets, and the country buying in the western half of Texas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, as well as the entire inter-mountain country. This is taking away the range men's dependence on the Corn Belt and they feel that their trading position is much more favorable than a decade ago and will strengthen with Pacific coast development.

Probably as many unrelated factors were grouped together as depressing influences on the cattle business in 1933 as have been experienced by it in any other recent year. Moisture was light over the range States during the grazing season, except in the higher elevations on the forest reserves. Where snow had been light in the mountains the previous winter, the lack of summer rains had a detri-

mental effect on the grass and consequently on the condition of the livestock. Only in those limited sections where snow had been normal and the spring run-off slow were there cattle of full weight and good flesh in the fall roundups.

Although range feeder cattle are not a direct consumer product, their market price is seriously influenced by degree of consumer demand for beef at the time of sale, as well as by the volume of grain in the Corn Belt. These two factors determine to a great extent the number of cattle which will be put on winter feed, irrespective of the cattle supply. As all feed grains were unusually short last year, feeder demand was probably not 85 percent of normal for a full supply of cattle. As the volume of consumer buying power averaged around 70 percent of the 1926 level, this depressed the market last fall for strictly fat cattle, which were in greater supply than during the previous year; and with reduced Corn Belt feeder buying, thousands of Choice quality feeder steers had to go to slaughter in only Common and Medium grade flesh, adding to the liberal tonnage being offered to the narrow consumer demand.

Another depressing factor was that after several years of light culling of cows from the herds on account of the low prices for the cheaper grades of meats, both dairy and range men last summer and fall decided to liquidate some of their accumulated holdings irrespective of price, which further added to the supply of beef.

Consequently the market for range cattle, which, last August, had a pretty fair undertone as a result of the summer improvement in business and pay rolls, soon began to meet one price obstacle after another, and culminated in the very low prices in November and December. When first indications of weakness in the market appeared in September, many stockmen delayed the normal movement of feeder cattle to market, buoyed up by the hope that expected increases in fall industrial employment would broaden the fat-cattle demand and create more optimism in Corn Belt cattle-feeding circles. The cattle feeder was doing the same thing, however, and many fat cattle that were sold in July should have gone to market in May, and those sold in October should have been turned into meat in August. This damming back of supplies has been a weakening influence in the cattle market for several months and as a result Choice heavyweight bullocks, which have consumed 100 to 125 bushels of corn in a year's feeding, have sold at prices \$1.50-2.00 per hundredweight less than Choice lightweight yearlings which have consumed less than 40 bushels of corn.

The final depressing factor was the abundance and cheapness of pork and of turkeys and other poultry for the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays.

Net financial results of the 1933 range year were definitely dependent on the influence of three things: (1) The time in the marketing season when stock was sold; (2) the local climatic conditions which governed grazing in particular sections and controlled both weight and finish of livestock marketed; and (3) the amount of indebtedness per head which had to be paid out of the year's proceeds.

A fourth and definite husbandry influence was the percentage of the calf crop which the individual ranchman secured. Some men came through the year with a real profit. They were the ones with a high percentage of calf crop of Good and Choice quality who sold

early, who were favored by sufficient summer moisture to make good grazing, and whose debt structure was not burdensome either as to the amount of interest or principal payments to be made out of the year's gross returns.

Influences of age and weight of feeders sold, and of date of sale on prices are further shown in the following facts: Values of calves and short yearlings of Good and Choice quality held almost uniformly at \$1.50-2.00 per hundredweight over 2-year-old feeders of like grades. Feeder steers, sold in August to go to the Corn Belt to clean up grain fields and meadows, in most instances brought \$1.50 per hundredweight more than comparable grades sold in November; this was due to the changed status of feed and demand conditions and to the larger supply. The response of progressive cattle feeders to the very definite trend in consumer requirements for light beef cuts was strikingly shown all through the season in the demand for the good quality lighter-weight stock over the heavier feeder types and at a price premium at all times.

One tremendous aid in solving the beef cattle industry's present problem of over-expansion in numbers can come by an intensification of this trend to lighter weight, younger animals. These kinds are more quickly finished and, by marketing such cattle, as much as a 20 percent increase in steer and heifer numbers could be placed in commercial channels with no increase in tonnage.

Consumers have taken all the beef the cattlemen have been willing to sell them at the ruinous prices of the last 3 years, yet per capita consumption is under 50 pounds annually. Consequently, the industry is actually in a favorable position to reap prompt benefit from a broadening of consumer demand during the next 6 months (which period will have elapsed before the range men have any considerable volume of livestock for sale except in the Southwest) or from the assistance that may come with the amendment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to include beef cattle as one of the basic commodities.

The range-cattle industry deals with living things which are part of a continuous annual process of production. Its principal market outlet as indicated above is not directly to actual consumers, but is secondary to the Corn Belt's interpretation of the outlook for prospective business conditions, with their corresponding effect on consumer demand for the fattened cattle 4 to 6 months after the initial sale. Its expansion or contraction embraces a longer cycle than governs almost any other major agricultural commodity except orchard products. It is less able to meet temporary or short-time economic changes other than by damming up supplies, as has been done in the case of cows in recent years. Those engaged in it have had to keep on producing in the face of known conditions unless willing or able to sacrifice, at ruinous prices, foundation stock built up through years of effort.

To be a range cattleman is to be an optimist. He couldn't continue in business if he wasn't, in fact. Certain innate temperamental qualities create the basis for the way he feels toward the future, no matter how bad the past or present situation may be. The present manifestation of these qualities is seen in his purchasing of the hundreds of purebred bulls at advanced prices to improve the quality of future calf crops, in the face of one of the most disastrous marketing seasons witnessed during the present generation.

JAMES K. WALLACE,
Livestock, Meats, and Wool Division.

MORE CATTLE—FEWER HOGS AND SHEEP ON FARMS

An increase in the number of cattle and decreases in the numbers of all other species of livestock during the year 1933 were shown by the annual inventory estimates of livestock-on-farms, made as of January 1, 1934. When the numbers of all species are converted to animal units which allow for differences in size and feed requirements of the several species practically no change is shown in total animal units.

The total value of all livestock on farms January 1, 1934, was \$2,854,217,000, an increase of about 7 percent over the total value on January 1, 1933. In the case of horses, mules, and sheep, sharp increases in values per head resulted in total values for each of these species higher than that of a year earlier in spite of the decreased numbers. The value per head of cattle was lower than on January 1, 1933, and the increase in the number of cattle was not sufficient to offset this decreased value per head so that the total value declined about 6 percent. Both the value per head and the total number of hogs were lower than they were a year earlier and the total value was 10 percent smaller. These inventory values of livestock on farms as of January 1 should not be confused with the value of livestock production nor with the income from livestock, which will be published later.

Horses.—The number of horses on farms continued to decrease in 1933 but at a less rapid rate than in recent years. The number on January 1, 1934, was 11,942,000 head, a decrease of about 2 percent from that on January 1, 1933. For the first time in many years the number of colts under 1 year considerably exceeded the number of such colts a year earlier. The value per head on January 1, 1934, was \$66.42, a sharp increase over a year earlier and the highest since January 1, 1930. The total value on January 1 this year was \$793,184,000, compared with \$655,653,000 on January 1, 1933.

Mules.—The number of mules also decreased again in 1933 and at about the same rate as in other recent years. The number on January 1, 1934, was 4,931,000 head, a decrease of 2 percent. The number of mule colts under 1 year was only slightly larger than that of a year earlier. The value per head of mules of all ages increased from \$60.17 on January 1, 1933, to \$81.56 on January 1, 1934. At the same time the total value increased from \$302,918,000 to \$402,171,000.

Cattle.—Cattle continued to increase in numbers during 1933, but the rate of increase was lower than in 1932. The number of all cattle on January 1, 1934, was 67,352,000 head, 2.8 percent larger than on January 1, 1933, and 19 percent larger than on January 1, 1928, the low point in numbers in recent years. The value per head on January 1 this year was \$18.28, compared with \$19.95 a year earlier and was the lowest in many years. The increased number of cattle was not sufficient to offset the decreased value per head and the total value was \$1,231,280,000 on January 1, 1934, compared with \$1,307,641,000 a year earlier.

The number of milk cows (cows and heifers 2 years old and over kept for milk), which is included in the total of all cattle, also increased during 1933. The number on January 1, 1934, of 26,062,000 head was 3.1 percent larger than on January 1, 1933, and was the largest on record. The value per head declined from \$29.25 on January 1, 1933, to \$27.09 on January 1, 1934. The number of yearling heifers kept for milk cows increased about 1 percent during 1933, or from 4,704,000 head to 4,749,000 head. Heifer calves being kept for milk cows in-

creased about 3 percent. Apparently a considerable part of the increase in milk cow numbers in 1933 came from an increased use of beef or dual purpose cows for milking.

Hogs.—The estimated number of hogs on farms January 1, 1934, was 55,976,000 head. This was a decrease of 9 percent from that of a year earlier. In the North Central (Corn Belt) States the decrease was about 8 percent. The value per head of \$4.16 was a little lower than on January 1, 1933, and was the lowest since 1897. The total value of hogs was \$232,946,000 this year and \$258,280,000 a year earlier.

Sheep.—The number of sheep decreased slightly in 1933. The total number on January 1, 1934, was 51,374,000 head compared with 51,736,000 head a year earlier, a decrease of less than 1 percent. All of the decrease was in sheep and lambs on feed for market, as there was a small increase in numbers of stock sheep. The value per head on January 1 this year was sharply higher than that of a year earlier, or it advanced from \$2.90 to \$3.79. The total value of all sheep January 1, 1934, was \$194,636,000 compared with \$150,017,000 a year earlier, an increase of about 30 percent.

NUMBERS AND VALUES OF LIVESTOCK ON FARMS IN THE UNITED STATES AS OF JAN. 1, 1934, WITH REVISIONS FOR 1933 AND 1932

Farm animals	Jan. 1, 1932		Jan. 1, 1933		Jan. 1, 1934	
	Per- cent of previ- ous year	Thou- sand head	Per- cent of previ- ous year	Thou- sand head	Per- cent of previ- ous year	Thou- sand head
Horses and colts.....	95. 8	12, 621	96. 6	12, 197	97. 9	11, 942
Mules and mule colts.....	98. 0	5, 120	98. 3	5, 034	98. 0	4, 931
Cattle and calves.....	102. 7	62, 656	104. 6	65, 552	102. 7	67, 352
Sheep and lambs ¹	101. 1	53, 155	97. 3	51, 736	99. 3	51, 374
Swine, including pigs.....	108. 4	58, 988	104. 0	61, 320	91. 3	55, 976
Cows and heifers ^{2 3}	103. 8	24, 475	103. 3	25, 277	103. 1	26, 062
Heifers ^{2 4}	98. 1	4, 685	100. 4	4, 704	101. 0	4, 749

Farm animals	Farm value per head	Total farm value (thou- sand dollars) ⁵	Farm value per head	Total farm value (thou- sand dollars) ⁵	Farm value per head	Total farm value (thou- sand dollars) ⁵
Horses and colts.....	\$53. 38	673, 649	\$53. 76	655, 653	\$66. 42	793, 184
Mules and mule colts.....	60. 56	310, 058	60. 17	302, 918	81. 56	402, 171
Cattle and calves.....	26. 62	1, 667, 843	19. 95	1, 307, 641	18. 28	1, 231, 280
Sheep and lambs ¹	3. 40	180, 780	2. 90	150, 017	3. 79	194, 636
Swine, including pigs.....	6. 13	361, 485	4. 21	258, 280	4. 16	232, 946
Cows and heifers ^{2 3}	39. 57	968, 460	29. 25	739, 430	27. 09	706, 074
Total, 5 species.....	-----	3, 193, 815	-----	2, 674, 509	-----	2, 854, 217

¹ Including sheep and lambs in feed lots on feed for market.

² Included in "Cattle and Calves".

³ 2 years old and over, kept for milk.

⁴ 1 to 2 years old, kept for milk cows.

⁵ Total value is sum of values by age groups.

NOTE.—The number of livestock not on farms, i.e., in cities and villages, is not included in these estimates.

THE DAIRY MARKET SITUATION

Lighter production, increased trade output of manufactured dairy products, and an upward swing of butter and cheese prices are important phases of the current dairy market situation. The butter price advance this month of more than 3 cents a pound, has been accompanied by an increase of over 2 cents a pound on fresh cheese. All of this means higher returns to producers for February milk. Even those producers who supply city milk at announced prices, will profit from such a change, either through the higher value of surplus milk sold on the basis of manufactured products prices, or the added strength given dairy markets generally.

The heavy decrease in butter production has not been entirely unexpected, since a shift in that direction has been evident for some time. December fell below a year earlier by close to 10 million pounds, and even in earlier months when there had been increases over 1932, the margin of increase had been gradually narrowing since August. The estimate for January shows a reduction of 16½ million pounds, or 12.9 percent below January 1933, with consistent decreases in all sections of the country except New York, California, and Oregon. In the case of New York State, where there was an increase of 62 percent over January 1933, this is in line with the situation which has existed in that area for some time, and while the increase is large in terms of percentage, it amounts in terms of volume to less than 600,000 pounds. December butter production was heavy in California, and this condition which carried over into January is now accompanied by a similar situation in Oregon. Other Pacific slope States, however, continue to lag behind last year's production. Declining production in general is due partly to the severe winter weather, and according to the last United States crop report to high feed costs in some areas. Weekly trade reports for February suggest a somewhat irregular production situation this month, although on the whole there is so far little indicated change from the January trend.

American cheese production in January was greatly reduced under January of last year, the total estimate of 19,900,000 pounds being a decrease of 16.5 percent. A number of areas showed increases, particularly the Pacific Coast, but drops of almost 27 percent in Wisconsin and 9 percent in New York more than offset increases elsewhere. Evaporated milk production in January was 15.6 percent below that of last year.

Early in the month, there was a continuation of the upward swing of butter prices which began early in January, but later this was checked and prices settled at 26 cents (92 score butter at New York), which figure, incidentally, was the highest point reached in 1933 and occurred for only a few days in July. Previous to then a 26 cents price had not prevailed since December 1932. The trend of butter prices this year has been almost directly the opposite of last year's trend, for January 1933 opened at 23 cents, going as low as 16¾ cents in early February. On the contrary, January opened this year at 19 cents, and has since reached a top of 26 cents. Despite opposite price trends, the average of 92 score at New York for both January 1933 and 1934 was the same, 19.8 cents. The February averages, however, will be quite different, last year's figure being 18.6 cents, while February 1934 to date has averaged 25.2 cents.

Cheese quotations, established weekly on the Wisconsin cheese boards, have risen steadily this year. Twins, which were 9¼ cents in early January, are now 13¼ cents, and other styles have advanced accordingly. A year ago Twins were quoted at 8 cents. The present relationship between butter and cheese prices is such as to make likely some shift to cheese production on the part of plants equipped to do so, and which have been temporarily diverting milk to other outlets.

Butter and cheese are almost alone in showing price changes this month. Fluid milk prices are lower in several markets, Chicago, Des Moines, and New Orleans, but the general average of all markets is the same as for January. Compared with a year ago, current prices to producers average 30 cents per hundredweight higher, and consumer prices about 1 cent per quart higher. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration is proceeding under the present policy of approving producer prices only, and have placed distributors in several important markets under licenses, one provision of which is that they pay producers the established local price scale. The Administration has already had to order several licensed dealers to show cause why their licenses should not be suspended or revoked.

The storage situation has changed materially since a month ago. Butter stocks in storage on February 1 totaled 76,051,000 pounds, a reduction of approximately 35 million pounds under January 1. An official statement of the Department indicates that 25 million pounds of the butter in storage on February 1 belonged to the Government, being butter purchased for distribution to the needy and unemployed through the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation. Government purchases up to February 1 for this purpose totaled 48,445,340 pounds, with contracts outstanding for another 600,000 pounds. Of this total amount, more than 23 million pounds had been moved out of storage and distributed by that date. Contemplated Government purchases include 12 million pounds in addition to the foregoing, making a total of 61,231,740 pounds.

The movement of butter into consumption through relief agencies, served to increase materially January trade output, which in comparison with January 1933 shows an increase of 14 million pounds, or 10.7 percent. Weekly storage reports from principal storing centers indicate an active out-of-storage movement again this month. Cheese and condensed and evaporated milk also moved into apparent consumption during January at a much greater rate than in 1933, the increases being 4.8 percent, 7.5 percent, and 29.5 percent. Taken together with butter, the net increase in terms of milk equivalent was 11.4 percent.

L. M. DAVIS,

Division of Dairy and Poultry Products.

THE EGG AND POULTRY MARKET SITUATION

The egg markets generally ruled steady to firm from the first of the year until the first part of February, when the desire to keep incoming supplies cleared closely against the possibility of much heavier receipts caused prices to drift gradually lower. The Federal program of buying storage eggs for relief purposes helped in reducing stocks of eggs in storage to a relatively insignificant quantity by February 1. Heavy snowstorms and severe cold weather throughout many of the egg pro-

ducing sections, together with rising feed costs, have tended to check production to a certain extent, and supplies reaching the principal terminal markets in January and the first part of February proved to be much less than was generally expected a few months ago.

Instead, therefore, of following the usual seasonal trend of the past few years, egg prices advanced up to the first week in February, when some increase in fresh supplies, particularly from the Middle West where the weather moderated more quickly than in the East, together with the efforts of dealers to keep stocks from accumulating against the period of increasing receipts, led to a somewhat weaker market and a gradual dropping off in prices. At no time, however, could it have been said that the market was over-supplied; in fact, a situation bordering on an actual shortage has at times been approached, with only a little incentive needed to cause a sharp, even though temporary, rise in prices.

Consumer demand is apparently showing some improvement over last year, for in spite of wholesale and retail prices several cents higher than a year ago, trade output in the 4 markets for the first 3 weeks of February was about 10 percent heavier than during the same period last year.

The storage situation has turned out much better than many dared to hope for when considering the large quantity of eggs in storage on August 1, 1933, in relation to those of the preceding year or the 5-year average. Instead of the heavy carry-over into 1934 that many had expected for the first of the year, stocks of that date were only about 60 percent of the 5-year average, although still considerably above the record breaking small stocks of January 1, 1933. By February 1 eggs in storage amounted to only 52,000 cases, which amount was not only less than the 75,000 cases reported on the same date last year, but much less than the 372,000 cases for the February 1 five-year average. While Federal purchases were in part responsible for this favorable situation, greater credit is due to the leaders in the trade who realized early last fall that a fairly satisfactory outcome was most likely to result at a level of prices which would encourage a heavy consumption all through the season, rather than to depend too much on a small late fall and early winter production for the market to be able to absorb the very large storage stocks.

It is a little too early to say much about the forthcoming 1934 storage deal, but casual observation would seem to indicate a more cautious approach than a year ago. Eggs started to move into storage last year the latter part of January, but so far there has been practically no storing done, even for "short-held" purposes. Present weather conditions may serve to check early production, and with the number of hens and pullets in farm laying flocks on February 1 amounting to only 83.6 per farm, compared to 86.6 a year ago and a 5-year average of 89.5, the supply of early eggs for storage may possibly be smaller than a year ago.

Should the present consumption demand continue, there will probably be little forced storing done at the beginning of the season to support the market or to save receivers from accepting a loss on the basis of high country costs, in relation to prevailing prices at time of arrival. Furthermore, with the administration's monetary policy more clearly defined, there will be considerably less urge to store eggs this spring in the hope of benefiting through further depreciation of the currency by next fall.

The live poultry market in February showed unexpected strength. Colored fowls advanced 3 cents on eastern markets, colored chickens 4 cents, and Plymouth Rock broilers 3 to 4 cents. These prices are 2 to 4 cents higher than at this time last year. Receipts of live poultry have been especially light, particularly those of broilers from nearby eastern areas, and in many cases have hardly been sufficient to satisfy trading requirements. Reports from many of the most important poultry producing sections indicate that the supply of poultry on farms is relatively light, advancing feed costs and low poultry prices last fall having encouraged apparently heavy farm marketings.

The receipts of fresh killed dressed poultry have also been light, but prices have remained practically unchanged, influenced no doubt by the large stocks of frozen poultry in storage. The season for fresh killed chickens is now practically over. Very few are being received, and these of irregular quality. Only an occasional lot is sufficiently soft meaty to find a ready sale.

The shift from fresh killed to frozen poultry has now been practically completed, except for fowl. Demand for frozen poultry seems to be somewhat better than a year ago on all classes save heavy fowl which are finding a very slow sale, principally because the receipts of fresh killed fowl are made up largely of this weight.

The February 1 cold storage report proved slightly disturbing in some quarters with its total of 120,157,000 pounds of frozen poultry. The reduction in stocks during January was only about 3,300,000 pounds compared with about 6,800,000 pounds in January last year, and with about 4,400,000 pounds for the January 5-year average. The greatest concern was felt over the large stocks of turkeys, which amounted to 19,947,000 pounds, compared with 16,628,000 pounds on February 1, last year, and 12,605,000 pounds for the 5-year average. It had been thought generally that the stocks of turkeys had been fairly well cleaned up by New Year, and the knowledge that the net into-storage movement in January was 4,215,000 compared to 2,142,000 pounds in January last year came as quite a surprise.

In spite of the large stocks of frozen poultry, however, as well as the large stocks of other meats, the trade feels that the situation is not without its optimistic features. Light receipts of both live and fresh killed poultry encourage the belief that the marketable stocks still in the country are not large, so that current receipts this spring will probably be smaller than a year ago. Further encouragement is also found in rising commodity prices, and the anticipation that additional advances may occur before the year is over.

B. H. BENNETT,

Division of Dairy and Poultry Products.

SUMMARY OF DAIRY STATISTICS

[Millions of pounds; 000,000 omitted]

PRODUCTION

Product	January		
	1934	1933	Percent change
Creamery butter.....	112	129	- 12. 9
Cheese.....	28	34	- 16. 2
Condensed milk.....	16	16	+ 0. 3
Evaporated milk ¹	99	117	- 15. 6
Total milk equivalent.....	2, 933	3, 382	- 13. 3

APPARENT CONSUMPTION

[Including production, changes in stocks, and net imports or exports]

Creamery butter.....	148	133	+ 10. 7
Cheese.....	44	42	+ 4. 8
Condensed milk.....	20	19	+ 7. 5
Evaporated milk ¹	139	107	+ 29. 5
Total milk equivalent.....	3, 939	3, 537	+ 11. 4

¹ Case goods only.

AGRICULTURAL LOANS OUTSTANDING ¹

[Millions of dollars]

Year and month	Farm mortgage loans by—				Federal intermediate credit bank loans—		Seed and crop production loans—			Loans of regional agricultural credit corporations
	Federal land banks	Joint-stock land banks	39 life insurance companies	Member banks	To co-operative associations	To financing agencies	Advanced, current	Re-paid, current	Out-standing end of year or month	
1926-----	1, 078	632	1, 575	489	53	40	2		2	
1927-----	1, 156	667	1, 606	478	32	44			2	
1928-----	1, 194	605	1, 594	444	36	45			2	
1929-----	1, 197	585	1, 579	388	26	50	6	5	3	
1930-----	1, 188	553	1, 543	387	64	66	5	3	5	
1931-----	1, 163	530	1, 503	359	45	75	54	6	53	
1932										
January-----	1, 158	525	1, 502		43	75		4	49	
June-----	1, 139	470	1, 458	363	36	80	68	8	109	
September-----	1, 129	454	1, 434	368	19	83		7	102	
December-----	1, 116	³ 409	1, 402	356	10	83		12	90	24
1933										
January-----	1, 112	³ 404	1, 394		7	81		2	88	42
February-----	1, 110	³ 399	1, 382		7	80		2	86	62
March-----	1, 107	³ 395	1, 368		6	81	13	1	98	83
April-----	1, 105	³ 390	1, 357		5	78	34	1	131	107
May-----	1, 103	³ 386	1, 343		4	78	6	1	136	128
June-----	1, 102	³ 382	1, 322	⁴ 308	4	78	3	1	138	145
July-----	1, 101	³ 378	1, 311		4	85	1	1	138	154
August-----	1, 104	³ 375	1, 300		5	102		5	133	158
September-----	1, 110	³ 372	1, 286		6	121		10	123	155
October-----	1, 125	³ 364	1, 266	⁴ 311	7	126		22	101	147
November-----	1, 156	³ 362	1, 248		10	131	1	11	91	143
December-----	1, 213	³ 354			15	134	1	3	88	145
1934										
January-----	1, 287	³ 344			15	135		12	75	145

¹ See April 1932 issue for sources.² Total since 1921.³ Omits \$53,000,000 owed Sept. 30, 1932, to 3 banks in receivership.⁴ Licensed banks only.NEW AGRICULTURAL LOANS, DISCOUNTS, AND INVESTMENTS ¹

[Thousands of dollars]

Year and month	29 life insurance companies' investments in farm mortgages	Federal land banks	Land bank commissioner's loans to farmers	Federal intermediate credit banks ²	Regional agricultural credit corporations	Production credit associations	Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund	Central bank for co-operatives	Regional banks for co-operatives
1933									
September-----	³ 2, 430	9, 267	3, 839	38, 179	10, 111	0	307	182	2
October-----	⁴ 1, 622	18, 813	9, 801	37, 186	12, 509	2	695	7, 162	51
November-----	⁴ 1, 656	34, 476	18, 317	41, 394	15, 132	4	484	6, 286	494
December-----		61, 426	36, 665	36, 749	19, 179	21	124	12, 562	406
1934									
January-----		77, 827	49, 795	26, 082	23, 395	150	253	123	663

¹ Data for life insurance companies from New York Evening Post. Other data from Farm Credit Administration.² Includes discounts outstanding for regional agricultural credit corporations.³ 5 weeks.⁴ 4 weeks.

PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS

Estimates of average prices received by producers at local farm markets based on reports to the division of crop and livestock estimates of this Bureau. Average of reports covering the United States weighted according to relative importance of district and State.

Product	5-year average, August 1909- July 1914	Febru- ary average, 1910-14	Febru- ary 1933	Janu- ary 1934	Febru- ary 1934	Parity price Febr- uary 1934
Cotton, per pound-----cents--	12. 4	12. 3	5. 5	10. 3	11. 7	14. 6
Corn, per bushel-----do-----	64. 2	60. 1	19. 4	43. 9	45. 6	75. 8
Wheat, per bushel-----do-----	88. 4	89. 2	32. 3	69. 4	72. 0	104. 3
Hay, per ton-----dollars--	11. 87	12. 02	5. 91	7. 78	8. 07	14. 01
Potatoes, per bushel-----cents--	69. 7	66. 3	37. 0	77. 2	87. 7	82. 2
Oats, per bushel-----do-----	39. 9	39. 8	13. 3	32. 5	34. 1	47. 1
Beef cattle, per 100 pounds dollars--	5. 21	5. 11	3. 31	3. 33	3. 67	6. 15
Hogs, per 100 pounds-----do-----	7. 22	7. 12	2. 94	3. 06	3. 87	8. 52
Chickens, per pound-----cents--	11. 4	11. 1	9. 4	9. 4	10. 2	13. 5
Eggs, per dozen-----do-----	21. 5	23. 7	11. 0	17. 6	15. 8	26. 6
Butter, per pound-----do-----	25. 5	26. 6	18. 4	19. 6	21. 7	30. 1
Butterfat, per pound-----do-----	26. 3	27. 4	15. 8	16. 1	21. 6	31. 0
Wool, per pound-----do-----	17. 8	18. 5	8. 8	24. 6	25. 4	21. 0
Veal calves, per 100 pounds dollars--	6. 75	6. 77	4. 75	4. 46	5. 02	7. 96
Lambs, per 100 pounds-----do-----	5. 90	5. 95	4. 19	5. 50	6. 55	6. 96
Horses, each-----do-----	142. 00	143. 00	62. 00	73. 00	80. 00	168. 00

COLD-STORAGE SITUATION

[Feb. 1 holdings, shows nearest millions; i.e., 000,000 omitted]

Commodity	5-year average	Year ago	Month ago	Febru- ary 1934
Apples, total-----barrels--	¹ 6, 972	¹ 6, 703	¹ 7, 135	¹ 5, 467
Frozen and preserved fruits pounds--	68	70	60	56
40 percent cream----40-quart cans--	-----	¹ 123	¹ 173	¹ 139
Creamery butter-----pounds--	34	18	111	76
American cheese-----do-----	57	54	78	66
Frozen eggs-----do-----	57	46	61	50
Shell eggs-----cases--	¹ 372	¹ 75	¹ 731	¹ 52
Total poultry-----pounds--	112	105	124	120
Total beef-----do-----	71	40	79	74
Total pork-----do-----	700	575	630	728
Lard-----do-----	85	53	133	169
Lamb and mutton, frozen-----do-----	3	2	4	4
Total meats-----do-----	852	664	778	878

¹ 3 ciphers omitted.

PRICE INDEXES FOR JANUARY 1934

Farm products figures from this Bureau; commodity groups from Bureau of Labor Statistics (latter shown to nearest whole number). Shows year ago and latest available month.

FARM PRODUCTS

[Prices received by producers, August 1909-July 1914=100]

Product	January 1933	December 1933	January 1934	Month's trend
Cotton.....	45	77	83	Higher.
Corn.....	30	65	68	Do.
Wheat.....	37	76	78	Do.
Hay.....	51	65	66	Do.
Potatoes.....	54	100	111	Do.
Beef cattle.....	63	60	64	Do.
Hogs.....	37	40	42	Do.
Chickens.....	82	75	82	Do.
Eggs.....	100	100	82	Lower.
Butter.....	81	82	77	Do.
Wool.....	50	136	138	Higher.

COMMODITY GROUPS

[Wholesale prices, 1910-14=100]¹

Group	January 1933	December 1933	January 1934	Month's trend
Farm products.....	60	78	82	Higher.
Foods.....	86	97	100	Do.
Hides and leather products.....	107	138	139	Do.
Textile products.....	92	136	136	Unchanged.
Fuel and lighting.....	125	139	139	Do.
Metals and metal products.....	92	98	100	Higher.
Building materials.....	127	155	156	Do.
Chemicals and drugs.....	88	91	92	Do.
House-furnishing goods.....	134	148	148	Unchanged.
All commodities.....	89	103	105	Higher.

¹ Indexes as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics divided by the following averages for 1910-14: Farm products, 71.3; foods, 64.5; hides and leather products, 64.5; textile products, 56.3; fuel and lighting, 52.7; metals and metal products, 85.3; building materials, 55.2; chemicals and drugs, 81.2; house-furnishing goods, 54.6; and all commodities, 68.5.

GENERAL TREND OF PRICES AND WAGES

[1910-14=100]

Year and month	Whole-sale prices of all commodities ¹	Industrial wages ²	Prices paid by farmers for commodities used in ³ —			Farm wages	Taxes ⁴
			Living	Production	Living-production		
1910-----	103	-----	98	98	98	97	-----
1911-----	95	-----	100	103	102	97	-----
1912-----	101	-----	101	98	99	101	-----
1913-----	102	-----	100	102	101	104	100
1914-----	99	-----	102	99	100	101	101
1915-----	102	101	107	104	105	102	110
1916-----	125	114	124	124	124	112	116
1917-----	172	129	147	151	149	140	129
1918-----	192	160	177	174	175	176	137
1919-----	202	185	210	192	200	206	172
1920-----	225	222	222	174	194	239	209
1921-----	142	203	161	141	150	150	223
1922-----	141	197	156	139	146	146	224
1923-----	147	214	160	141	149	166	228
1924-----	143	218	159	143	150	166	228
1925-----	151	223	164	147	154	168	232
1926-----	146	229	162	146	153	171	232
1927-----	139	231	159	145	151	170	238
1928-----	141	232	160	148	153	169	239
1929-----	139	236	158	147	152	170	241
1930-----	126	226	148	140	144	152	238
1931-----	107	207	126	122	124	116	218
1932-----	95	178	108	107	107	86	189
1933-----	96	-----	109	108	109	80	-----
1933							
April-----	88	165	-----	-----	101	73	-----
May-----	92	169	-----	-----	102	-----	-----
June-----	95	172	102	104	103	-----	-----
July-----	101	176	-----	-----	107	78	-----
August-----	102	176	-----	-----	112	-----	-----
September-----	103	179	117	114	116	-----	-----
October-----	104	177	-----	-----	116	86	-----
November-----	104	175	-----	-----	116	-----	-----
December-----	103	176	117	114	116	-----	-----
1934							
January-----	105	179	-----	-----	116	81	-----

¹ Bureau of Labor Statistics. Index obtained by dividing the new series 1926=100, by its pre-war average, 1910-14, 68.5.² Average weekly earnings, New York State factories. June 1914=100.³ Revised. These indexes are based on retail prices paid by farmers for commodities used in living and production reported quarterly for March, June, September, and December. The indexes for other months are straight interpolations between the successive quarterly indexes.⁴ Revised. Index of farm real estate taxes, per acre, 1913=100.

GENERAL TREND OF PRICES AND PURCHASING POWER

[On 5-year base, August 1909-July 1914=100]

Year and month	Index numbers of farm prices							Prices paid by farmers for commodities bought ¹²	Ratio of prices received to prices paid ²
	Grains	Fruits and vegetables	Cotton and cotton-seed	Meat animals	Dairy products	Poultry products	All groups		
1910.....	104	91	113	103	100	104	103	98	105
1911.....	96	106	101	87	97	91	95	102	93
1912.....	106	110	87	95	103	101	99	99	100
1913.....	92	92	97	108	100	101	100	101	99
1914.....	103	100	85	112	100	105	102	100	102
1915.....	120	83	78	104	98	103	100	105	95
1916.....	126	123	119	120	102	116	117	124	94
1917.....	217	202	187	173	125	157	176	149	118
1918.....	226	162	245	202	152	185	200	175	114
1919.....	231	189	247	206	173	206	209	200	104
1920.....	231	249	248	173	188	222	205	194	106
1921.....	112	148	101	108	148	161	116	150	77
1922.....	105	152	156	113	134	139	124	146	84
1923.....	114	136	216	106	148	145	135	149	90
1924.....	129	124	211	109	134	147	134	150	89
1925.....	156	160	177	139	137	161	147	154	95
1926.....	129	189	122	146	136	156	136	153	89
1927.....	128	155	128	139	138	141	131	151	87
1928.....	130	146	152	150	140	150	139	153	91
1929.....	121	136	145	156	140	159	138	152	91
1930.....	100	158	102	134	123	126	117	144	81
1931.....	63	98	63	93	94	96	80	124	65
1932.....	44	71	46	63	70	80	57	107	53
1933.....	62	80	64	59	69	74	63	109	58
1933									
April.....	47	66	49	57	59	56	53	101	52
May.....	62	68	65	65	63	62	62	102	61
June.....	63	74	69	66	65	55	64	103	62
July.....	94	103	84	66	71	67	76	107	71
August.....	81	120	71	63	72	67	72	112	64
September.....	78	101	69	62	76	77	70	116	60
October.....	68	86	71	63	78	94	70	116	60
November.....	74	81	76	59	78	105	71	116	61
December.....	73	83	77	52	76	95	68	116	59
1934									
January.....	75	92	82	55	73	82	70	116	60
February.....	78	101	93	64	77	77	76	118	64

¹ These index numbers are based on retail prices paid by farmers for commodities used in living and production, reported quarterly for March, June, September, and December. The indexes for other months are straight interpolations between the successive quarterly indexes.

² Revised.

THE TREND OF MOVEMENT OF MARKET

Figures show wheat, corn, hogs, cattle, and sheep receipts at primary markets; butter receipts at five markets, compiled by this Bureau.

Year and month	Receipts					
	Wheat	Corn	Hogs	Cattle	Sheep	Butter
Total:	<i>1,000 bushels</i>	<i>1,000 bushels</i>	<i>1,000</i>	<i>1,000</i>	<i>1,000</i>	<i>1,000 pounds</i>
1920	332,091	209,079	42,121	22,197	23,538	402,755
1921	416,179	338,216	41,101	19,787	24,168	468,150
1922	413,106	378,598	44,068	23,218	22,364	526,714
1923	386,430	271,858	55,330	23,211	22,025	545,380
1924	482,007	278,719	55,414	23,695	22,201	587,477
1925	346,381	223,604	43,929	24,067	22,100	574,489
1926	362,876	234,873	39,772	23,872	23,868	572,935
1927	455,991	241,245	41,411	22,763	23,935	581,592
1928	495,450	335,149	46,527	21,477	25,597	577,929
1929	437,681	264,934	43,715	20,387	26,834	602,665
1930	402,398	247,483	40,774	19,166	29,808	584,196
1931	420,758	172,514	39,537	19,617	33,022	609,611
1932	255,042	150,064	35,030	17,333	29,303	610,785
1933	219,744	258,905	40,369	16,994	27,139	663,221
January:						
1920	30,780	18,276	4,200	1,395	1,566	21,573
1921	21,616	42,639	3,931	1,417	1,664	30,839
1922	46,002	38,145	5,004	1,825	1,516	32,334
1923	28,756	37,930	5,825	1,801	1,526	34,888
1924	33,076	29,239	6,604	2,083	1,605	33,155
1925	33,670	32,587	4,380	2,056	1,608	36,199
1926	19,831	22,528	3,910	1,846	1,706	36,054
1927	23,903	36,777	4,209	1,691	1,609	33,687
1928	31,976	44,128	4,773	1,510	1,610	36,863
1929	21,346	31,376	4,221	1,551	1,701	39,843
1930	21,030	27,580	4,002	1,736	2,307	43,892
1931	13,073	11,195	4,210	1,453	2,182	47,194
1932	12,982	11,532	3,123	1,162	1,657	43,074
1933	12,313	12,602	3,381	1,318	1,914	50,828
1933						
July	36,704	46,260	2,871	1,456	2,228	64,057
August	25,496	11,591	1,924	1,669	2,752	63,877
September	21,833	21,435	1,649	1,652	2,911	54,844
October	15,042	23,285	2,521	2,178	3,268	50,801
November	10,764	22,005	3,207	1,203	2,064	47,955
December	10,910	16,308	3,332	901	1,774	49,226
1934						
January	8,278	14,669	4,231	1,141	1,818	45,882

¹ Includes hogs purchased on Government account from Aug. 23 to Sept. 29, 1933.

THE TREND OF EXPORT MOVEMENT

Compiled from the Department of Commerce reports by the foreign agricultural service division of this Bureau.

Year and month	Wheat, ¹ including flour	Tobacco (leaf)	Bacon, ² hams, and shoulders	Lard ³	Apples (fresh)	Cotton ⁴ running bales
Total:	<i>1,000 bushels</i>	<i>1,000 pounds</i>	<i>1,000 pounds</i>	<i>1,000 pounds</i>	<i>1,000 bushels</i>	<i>1,000 bales</i>
1920----	311, 601	467, 662	821, 922	612, 250	5, 393	6, 111
1921----	359, 021	515, 353	647, 680	868, 942	5, 809	6, 385
1922----	235, 307	430, 908	631, 452	766, 950	4, 945	6, 015
1923----	175, 190	474, 500	828, 890	1,035,382	8, 876	5, 224
1924----	241, 454	546, 555	637, 980	944, 095	10, 261	6, 653
1925----	138, 784	468, 471	467, 459	688, 829	10, 043	8, 362
1926----	193, 971	478, 773	351, 591	698, 961	16, 170	8, 916
1927----	228, 576	506, 252	237, 720	681, 303	15, 534	9, 199
1928----	151, 976	575, 408	248, 278	759, 722	13, 635	8, 546
1929----	154, 348	555, 347	275, 118	829, 328	16, 856	7, 418
1930----	149, 154	560, 958	216, 953	642, 486	15, 850	6, 474
1931----	125, 686	503, 531	123, 246	568, 708	17, 785	6, 849
1932----	82, 118	387, 766	84, 175	546, 202	16, 919	8, 916
1933----	27, 512	420, 418	100, 169	579, 072	11, 029	8, 353
January:						
1920----	12, 358	46, 757	91, 407	38, 824	483	922
1921----	27, 361	46, 852	60, 072	76, 185	1, 776	600
1922----	15, 231	32, 265	48, 120	73, 194	472	459
1923----	12, 751	41, 309	74, 432	107, 786	653	471
1924----	12, 486	47, 579	79, 067	132, 758	1, 342	540
1925----	13, 126	35, 448	56, 169	78, 440	930	1, 052
1926----	5, 587	46, 891	46, 654	76, 670	1, 155	735
1927----	12, 821	66, 403	20, 597	59, 842	1, 497	1, 074
1928----	11, 809	42, 600	22, 212	70, 660	1, 211	712
1929----	9, 833	44, 166	24, 669	90, 137	3, 165	787
1930----	14, 073	46, 155	23, 738	73, 292	1, 308	729
1931----	5, 731	46, 579	12, 761	68, 882	2, 387	533
1932----	8, 134	24, 344	5, 769	59, 855	2, 708	920
1933----	3, 313	26, 915	6, 666	78, 108	1, 766	794
1933						
July-----	1, 391	28, 828	10, 994	36, 200	130	692
August-----	1, 721	23, 440	9, 385	35, 714	490	531
September----	1, 531	40, 881	8, 632	48, 743	435	869
October-----	1, 490	64, 464	8, 147	49, 812	1, 433	1, 047
November----	1, 930	42, 566	10, 306	47, 563	1, 695	915
December----	6, 876	60, 783	6, 561	54, 778	1, 896	820
1934						
January----	5, 548	25, 753	4, 965	51, 202	2, 556	739

¹ Wheat flour is converted on a basis of 4.7 bushels of grain equal to 1 barrel of flour.

² Includes Cumberland and Wiltshire sides.

³ Excludes neutral lard.

⁴ Excludes linters.

GENERAL BUSINESS INDICATORS RELATED TO AGRICULTURE

Production, consumption, and movements	January 1933	December 1933	January 1934	Month's trend
<i>Production</i>				
Pig iron (thousand tons)-----	18	38	39	Increase.
Bituminous coal (million tons)-	27	30	33	Do.
Steel ingots (thousand long tons).	1, 030	1, 820	1, 997	Do.
<i>Consumption</i>				
Cotton, by mills (thousand bales).	470	348	508	Do.
United States Steel Corporation shipments of finished steel products (thousand tons).	285	601	332	Decrease.
Building contracts in 37 Northeastern States (million dollars).	83	207	187	Do.
Hogs slaughtered (thousands)-	2, 401	2, 406	3, 010	Increase.
Cattle slaughtered (thousands).	553	558	737	Do.
Sheep slaughtered (thousands).	1, 083	1, 033	1, 132	Do.
<i>Movements</i>				
Bank debits (outside New York City) (billion dollars).	12	13	13	Unchanged.
Carloadings (thousands)-----	1, 924	2, 565	2, 178	Decrease.
Mail-order sales (million dollars).	27	62	37	Do.
Employees, New York State factories (thousands).	274	328	326	Do.
Average price 25 industrial stocks (dollars).	94. 81	137. 27	140. 48	Increase.
Interest rate (4-6 months' paper, New York) (percent).	1. 38	1. 38	1. 38	Unchanged.
Retail food price index (Department of Labor). ^{1 2}	98	107	109	Increase.
Wholesale price index (Department of Labor). ¹	89	103	105	Do.

¹ 1910-14 basis.² Nov. 21 and Dec. 19, 1933.

Data in the above table, excepting livestock slaughter and price indexes, are from the Survey of Current Business, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce.